

Masiats aghavni (Dove of Ararat), a clerical paper, moved to Theodosia.

Nalbandian left Russia to travel in Europe. He met Stepan Voskan in Paris.

- 1860 *Krunk Haiots Ashkarhin* (Crane of the Armenian World) appeared in Tiflis; it published on secular themes, including the novel *Sosev Vartiter* by Perch Proshian (Hovhannes Ter-Arakelian) (1837-1907).

Bishop Jalalian, now Primate of Georgia, suppressed liberal tendencies in the Nersesian Jemaran in Tiflis.

Karapet Hairapetov, a reform candidate supported by Nalbandian, was elected to the magistracy of Nor Nakhichevan.

- 1861 Gabriel Ter-Hovhannisian's anti-clerical novel *Ter-Sarkis* appeared.

Rafayel Patkanian (penname, Kamar-Katipa) (1830-1892) published "The Death of the Brave Vardan Mamikonian."

SERFDOM ABOLISHED IN RUSSIA, but not yet in Transcaucasia.

- 1862 Nalbandian, who had travelled to Europe and India (1860-1862), returned to Russia and was arrested.

- 1863 Direct telegraph communications were established between Tiflis and Saint Petersburg.

The first Armenian dramatic circle was formed in Tiflis.

Rafayel Patkanian founded the weekly *Hiusis* in St. Petersburg.

- 1864 *Hiusisapayl* was closed down by the government. Nazarian became director of the Nersesian Jemaran.

Serfdom was abolished in Tiflis Province.

- 1865 Rebellion by the craftsmen of Tiflis against new taxes.

First cotton-cloth mill built in Tiflis by the Mirzoev brothers.

- 1866 Death of Mikayel Nalbandian.

Mikayel Nalbandian and Non-Territorial Armenian Nationalism

Sarkis Shmavonian

I. IT MAY be said in a general sense that non-territorial Armenian nationalism in Russia developed at the same time that Russian romantic nationalist doctrines, such as Slavophilism, Official Nationality, Westernism, gained a wide following among young educated Russians. But there the comparison ends. Why should this be so? It is worth investigating the contrasting elements in Russian and Armenian institutional backgrounds which made common cause between cultural nationalists from either side difficult to achieve, even if they had wanted such contact.

The Armenian variant of cultural nationalism displays so many special characteristics because of its adaptation to changing Russian administrative policies that it deserves independent treatment, at least before 1860. Its innovative and adaptive features took shape only when old, local Armenian political, corporate, and fiscal privileges began to disappear rapidly. After the abolition of the Transcaucasian *Armianskaia oblast'* (*Haykakan marz*) in 1840, new forms of non-territorial Armenian nationalism grew up around substitute cultural and political institutions in order to reinforce the separate identity of the Armenian minority, partly in face of a perceived threat of russification.

The earliest manifestations of such non-territorial cultural awareness developed from the 1830s to the late 1850s through a romantic interest in *völkisch* (*azgayin*) literature and literary ideologies — roughly analog to Russian Slavophilism — which flourished in a circle of Armenian students at the University of Dorpat (modern Tartu) in the Baltic region. Khachatur Abovian (1805-1848) was the founder of the Dorpat group. In the 1830s he translated selections of Homer, Karamzin, Zhukovskii, Krylov, Schiller, Goethe, and Rousseau into the newly formed modern Armenian language

(*ashkharhabar*) as a means of encouraging popular education through worthwhile literary models.¹

A second source of early non-territorial national consciousness among Russian Armenians was the Armenian Gregorian or Apostolic Church, which was increasing its political power in the early nineteenth century under the titular authority of the Catholicos in Etchmiadzin. After the suppression of the *Armianskaia oblast'*, the Russian government patronized the Church heavily as a counterweight to territorial nationalism in Transcaucasia, and Etchmiadzin proceeded to centralize the local Apostolic diocesan courts and schools into a national institution of Armenian administration in Russia.

Still a third source of non-territorial nationalism grew out of the Church, not as an instrument of government but, paradoxically, as an agent of secularization. In the late 1850s Stepanos Nazariants, Mikayel Nalbandian, and other young nationalists turned to the diocesan schools as a suitable institution, already in place, for spreading Western secular and nationalist ideas among the Armenian people. This reformist and modernizing tendency, though vaguely stated, grew out of the Church's enforcement of a uniform system of religious education. By 1858, the Armenian professional and educated class had voiced enough interest in widening the clerical school curriculum to permit the establishment of a secular, nationalist journal *Hiusisapayl* (Northern Light) in Moscow.

The dispute over secularization of the diocesan schools lasted from the 1850s through the 1860s, and — with the notable exception of Tiflis — the strongest reaction against Etchmiadzin's central direction of educational policy occurred far from Transcaucasia, in Astrakhan and Nakhichevan. Astrakhan's Armenian community had received a formal charter of settlement in 1763, along with the right to form the first Armenian Apostolic diocese in Russia. In 1779 Catherine II invited Armenians from the Crimea, then still outside the Empire, to found Nakhichevan near the mouth of the Don. The colony was granted a charter of settlement, permission to establish an Armenian Apostolic congregation (within the jurisdiction of Astrakhan), and exemption from the head tax.² After Russia annexed the Crimea in 1783, the particular taxation privileges of the Nakhichevan charter were extended to the long-established Armenian colonies in Karasubazar,

¹Louise Nalbandian, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement: The Development of Armenian Political Parties Through the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963), pp. 38-40.

²*Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii*. 1st ser. 45 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1830); 2nd ser. 55 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1830-1884); 3rd ser. 28 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1911), XX, no. 14942, November 14, 1779, secs. 2-4. [This collection of laws henceforth will be referred to simply as *PSZ*.] The Armenian colony on the Don will be referred to as "Nakhichevan," since it is sufficiently distinguished by context from Nakhichevan uezd in Transcaucasia.

Saryi Krym, and Grigoropol'.³ Thus Armenians of Russia, living in marginal regions of the empire, were given encouragement and protection to develop their mercantile and artisanal economy with little interference from the tsarist state. But these Crimea, Nakhichevan, and Astrakhan Armenians were also geographically isolated from the main body of Armenian population in Transcaucasia.

Due in part to long contact with Greeks and Italians in a maritime culture along Black Sea trade routes, Armenians of southern Russia were already more westernized than those still under Persian and Georgian rule. Indeed, they had experienced Italian missionary influence through Uniate or Mekhitarist Catholics long before they entered the Russian Empire. Later when the Ottoman Turkish government, in concert with the Armenian Apostolic Patriarchate of Constantinople, began persecuting Armenian Catholics (1820), thousands of families migrated to the Crimea and settled at Theodosia "where their compatriots lived." The Emperor Alexander I was not opposed to allowing these Catholic Armenians to enter Russian territory, provided they did so unofficially and without the protection they had requested from the Russian diplomatic mission in Constantinople. A substantial, but unrecorded, number of refugees did in fact emigrate to the Armenian colonies in the Crimea between 1820 and 1831 (when an Armenian Catholic *millet* was formally recognized by the Sultan).⁴ Many Apostolic Armenians, in turn, moved from the Crimea to new settlements in Bessarabia, Nakhichevan, and Grigoropol'. By 1837, only Saryi Krym, which had been recolonized by Armenians from Nakhichevan, still retained the character of an Apostolic settlement. Karasubazar, for example, had twenty-four mosques, a Greek church, two Catholic churches (Roman and Armenian), but no Apostolic church. Nearby, the port of Theodosia (Kafa) had a Greek church, two synagogues (karaite and rabbinical), and an Armenian Catholic church.⁵

³The tax was assessed "*ne po dusham, a po dvoram*" (not by the soul, but by the household) at a rate so low that the act amounted in fact to a commercial subsidy. (Cited in *PSZ*, 2nd ser., XV:1, no. 13987, November 25, 1840.)

⁴V.A. Mikayelian, "Ghrimahai gaghuti patmutiunits," *Patma-banasirakan handes*, 3(1969):122-123. Mikayelian cites official Russian accounts of the expulsion and Russian estimates of 1820 for the number of Armenian Catholic refugees from Constantinople. The figure of 15,000-20,000 families appears high; the actual number of refugees was certainly not of this order and perhaps as little as one-fourth of this estimate. (Cf. Sukias Somal, "Lettre du Patriarche arménien catholique," *Annales de la propagation de la foi*, III (1828), p. 586, for a Catholic account of the expulsion.)

⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 120-121, 124. Anatole de Demidoff, *Travels in Southern Russia and the Crimea* (London, 1853), II, pp. 183, 198. The total Armenian population of the Crimea stood at 5,400 in 1840, a decline from about 15,000 in 1775. Also, the Apostolic Armenians who returned to Saryi Krym did so without passports or other authorization, and only 236 poorer families without "immoveable property" in Nakhichevan were allowed to remain.

Theodosia was the birthplace of Gabriel *vardapet* Ayvazovskii (1812-1880), a convert from Catholicism and Nalbandian's most persistent critic in the Apostolic hierarchy.

By contrast Nakhichevan contained six Apostolic churches, the Holy Cross (Surb Khach') monastery, as well as the clerical government for the Apostolics remaining in the Crimea. After 1830 Nakhichevan, together with Grigoropol', constituted the eastern zone of the new diocese of Nakhichevan-Bessarabia.⁶ Moreover, the town's prosperity was remarkable, even within the expanding mercantile economy of the Black Sea region. At the end of the eighteenth century Nakhichevan was already an important marketplace for the grain crops, silk fabrics, and metal articles produced locally in its satellite villages. By 1850, the town was in regular commercial contact with the Armenian communities in cities as distant as Leipzig and Calcutta.⁷ The traveller and diarist P.S. Pallas estimated the Armenian population of the entire district in 1783 at 7,000.⁸ By 1858 Nakhichevan proper had grown to 13,178, while another 6,366 Armenians lived in surrounding villages.⁹

Russian conquests in Transcaucasia after 1800 incorporated former Persian and Turkish territories inhabited by an additional 265,000 Armenians. This new population was governed under tax regulations and units of administration drastically different from those instituted in the Black Sea colonies.¹⁰ The former Persian khanates of Erevan and Nakhichevan were united in 1828 to form the *Armianskaia oblast'*. Nicholas I staffed the region with an Armenian bureaucracy and even granted it an official emblem devised from the old Armenian royal standard.¹¹ But this exercise in Armenian national administration turned out to be a local and temporary phenomenon. By 1830 Russia had permitted another 100,000 Armenians to cross the frontier from the eastern provinces of Turkey and settle on abandoned Muslim lands directly to the north and east of the *oblast'*.¹² Though the flow of

⁶S.G. Areshian, *Armianskaia pechat' i tsarskaia tsenzura* (Erevan, 1957), p. 37; PSZ, 2nd ser., V:1, no. 3060, April 23, 1830. The diocese of Nakhichevan-Bessarabia was constituted from the southern and western zones of the diocese of Astrakhan. Kishinev became the new diocesan seat for Apostolic Armenians in Bessarabia, Novorossiia guberniia, and the cities of Moscow and St. Petersburg. Nerses Ashtaraketsi was the primate of this diocese from 1830 until 1843 when he was elected Catholicos.

⁷P.S. Pallas, *Travels through the Southern Provinces of the Russian Empire* (London, 1802), I, pp. 476-480; E.I. Druzhinina, *Severnoe Prichernomor'e 1775-1800 gg.* (Moscow, 1959), pp. 176, 226, 252; A.M. Injikian, *Mikayel Nalbandiani kianki ev gortsuneutian taregrutiune* (Erevan, 1954), pp. 172-174; Demidoff, *Travels*, I, p. 360.

⁸Pallas, *Travels*, p. 480.

⁹TsSK, *Gorodskii poseleniia v Rossiiskoi imperii* (St. Petersburg, 1861), II, p. 205.

¹⁰The economy of Transcaucasia (and of the *Armianskaia oblast'* in particular) also differed substantially from that of the Black Sea region. Transcaucasia was almost entirely rural and agricultural in character, with most of its produce destined for local markets until the commercialization of agriculture began in the late 1850s. (See V. Rshtuni, *Krest'ianskaia reforma v Armenii v 1870 g.* [Erevan, 1947], pp. 40-43, 148.

¹¹PSZ, 2nd ser. III, no. 1888, March 21, 1828. Richard Hovannisian, *Armenia on the Road to Independence, 1918* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967), p. 10.

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 9.

refugees was curtailed after 1830, a growing threat of territorial nationalism among the Transcaucasian Armenians encouraged the Russian government to abolish the *oblast'* in 1840 and to divide its territory between two large Transcaucasian administrative units.¹³ In the twelve years of the *oblast'*, the proportion of Armenians in the area had risen from one-third to one half of the total population.¹⁴ The new units were gerrymandered so that Armenians formed a minority in each.

As important as the consolidation of Armenians in the area around Erevan was, this demographic process was less significant in the origins of Russian Armenian nationalism than were contemporary political-religious changes. After the annexation of the Erevan khanate in 1828, the See of the Apostolic Church at Etchmiadzin lay within Russian territory for the first time. The number of Apostolic dioceses in Russia grew from one to six: Erevan (Etchmiadzin), Georgia (Tiflis), Karabagh (Shusha), Shirvan (Shemakha), Nakhichevan-Bessarabia, and Astrakhan. In recognition of the shift in political boundaries, the *Polozhenie o upravlenii delami Armiano-Gregorianskoi tserkvi v Rossii* ("Law on the governance of the affairs of the Armenian-Apostolic Church in Russia") in 1836 legally established the primacy of the Catholicos of Etchmiadzin over the Apostolic Armenians in the Russian Empire.¹⁵ Still, the *Polozhenie* did grant local dioceses considerable autonomy. Clerical matters were to be "reviewed and decided in the ecclesiastical locality of the Church," that is, in the diocese.¹⁶ The primate of each diocese (the archbishop or, less frequently, the bishop) was responsible for introducing "a regular and convenient order of instruction" in the schools and to maintain "well-disposed relations between teachers and students."¹⁷ The consistory of each diocese, in addition to its normal judiciary functions, was responsible for registering parishioners, students, and teachers.¹⁸ Similarly, only the seminary at the monastery of Etchmiadzin was placed under the immediate authority of the Catholicos; all other seminaries were dependent on their respective diocesan primates.¹⁹ Within this decen-

¹³For the territorial composition of the Armenian *uezdy* in the new Georgian-Imeretian guberniia, see PSZ, 2nd ser., XV:1, no. 13368, April 10, 1840, secs. 64-66.

¹⁴Hovannisian, *Armenia*, p. 10. The total population of the *Armianskaia oblast'* in 1840 was 165,000.

¹⁵PSZ, 2nd ser., XI:1, no. 8970, March 11, 1836. In contrast to Muslim religious law, under which the Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople was responsible for the internal government of his *millet*, the regulations governing the offices and administration of the Apostolic Church in Russia became, in all details, part of the civil code of the empire.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, sec. 5.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, sec. 66.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, sec. 77:13.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, sec. 113.

tralized structure the educational discipline and curriculum of the diocesan schools, including the seminaries, were the responsibility of the primate of each diocese. The primate would decide what subjects, secular or religious, to offer. The Catholicos, in council with the Holy Synod, decided only ecclesiastical matters which touched on dogma.²⁰ Nevertheless, as a high ecclesiastical court, the Holy Synod exercised powers of appellate review over the decisions of the diocesan primates and the consistories.²¹

Then, with the suppression of the *Armianskaia oblast'*, this structure tightened dramatically. As it rearranged the territorial divisions in Transcaucasia, the Russian government vigorously promoted the extra-territorial authority of the Catholicos and the Holy Synod. The Synod, by imposing new *de facto* and *de jure* responsibilities on the lower consistorial courts, became an instrument for the centralization of Armenian communities around the Church at Etchmiadzin.²² The occasion of the change was a regulation in 1841 which established an Apostolic clerical school attached to the secular Lazarev Institute in Moscow. This school was to provide advanced training to ecclesiastical personnel in several branches of religious administration.²³ A major corollary provision of the statute released the Armenian churches and other ecclesiastical institutions in Moscow and St. Petersburg from all state and municipal obligations and united them into a single corporate government.²⁴ In all matters of management and finance the trustees of this government were responsible to the consistory of Nakhichevan-Bessarabia and, ultimately, to the Synod itself. While the Armenian communities in the two Russian capitals were becoming increasingly influential, particularly through their contribution to Armenian learning, the diocese of Nakhichevan-Bessarabia was changing from an autonomous entity into an intermediate level of bureaucracy between Etchmiadzin and the clerical governments of Moscow and St. Petersburg.²⁵ Clearly, both Nakhichevan and Astrakhan declined in status as the center of Armenian affairs in Russia proper shifted to Moscow and St. Petersburg.

The election of an aggressive new Catholicos, Nerses V Ashtaraketsi (1843-1857), marked the final step in Etchmiadzin's assumption of *de facto* control over all Armenian Apostolic diocesan schools in Russia.

²⁰*Ibid.*, sec. 25.

²¹*Ibid.*, sec. 36:2.

²²PSZ, 2nd ser. XVI:1, no. 14235, January 31, 1841, secs. 10, 17-18. Henceforth the Synod had authority to delegate functions of central Church administration to the consistories.

²³*Ibid.*, sec. 1.

²⁴*Ibid.*, secs. 6, 12.

²⁵The old diocese of Astrakhan declined sharply as a center of Church administration after the formation of Nakhichevan-Bessarabia in 1830.

In 1845 Catholicos Nerses and the Holy Synod began to close down or purge the diocesan schools in Tiflis, Astrakhan, and Nakhichevan, disregarding the independent growth of secular education in these important provincial mercantile communities. For its part, the Russian state extended police support to the Synod, arresting and removing Armenian clerics throughout the empire for resisting the curtailment of independent secular curricula. This campaign against self-willed local programs of secularization occurred simultaneously with the expansion of the Russian educational system itself as a rigorous instrument of state control. As early as 1829 Russian state schools had been set up in the *Armianskaia oblast'*, and in 1835 the comprehensive reform of Russian education, codified in the *Polozhenie ob uchebnykh okrugakh* (Law on Educational Districts), established a national network of elementary and secondary schools and a standard curriculum designed to assure a supply of functionaries for the expanding civil bureaucracy.²⁶ By 1845 Etchmiadzin likewise had extended its school system for Armenians throughout Russia. Besides the "separate department" in Moscow, important centers of higher clerical education had been founded in Tiflis (the Nersesian Jemaran, 1823) and Etchmiadzin (Gevorgian Seminary, reformed 1830). Whereas predominantly secular university education was being extended among the Russian population, the Armenian Church was opening ecclesiastical equivalents aimed principally at the production of theological doctors and clerical functionaries for the new Church administration. The reformed elementary and secondary curriculum for Armenian schools was fixed at five subjects: reading, grammar, arithmetic, catechism, and religious history; and the authorized texts and written exercises at every level were still composed principally in *grabar*, classical Armenian.²⁷

Etchmiadzin's efforts to bring lay teachers into line were not wholly successful in the westernized Armenian communities of Tiflis, Astrakhan, Moscow, St. Petersburg, and Nakhichevan. There the local complements of teachers and clerks in the diocesan schools formed the only departments of the Church in which the lower and higher orders of priests, the *kahanas* and *vardapets* respectively, held commensurate ranks.²⁸ Secular education in the schools of these communities was

²⁶PSZ, 2nd ser., X:1, no. 8262, June 25, 1835. The standard Russian lower curriculum in the provincial schools at this time comprised five subjects: grammar, arithmetic, catechism, reading, and penmanship. All texts and exercises, of course, were in the modern Russian language.

²⁷Injikian, *Taregrutiune*, pp. 18-20, 48.

²⁸The *vardapets* were trained in seminaries and were entitled thereby to hold positions in the diocesan schools and consistories, as well as in the local clerical governments. In addition, the *vardapets* consigned the normal reserve for the higher clergy. The married priests, the *kahanas*, served simply as pastors of village congregations, but as an order they identified their duties more closely with the interests of the communities in which they resided than with the purposes of the Church at large.

dominated by an elite of exceptionally accomplished *kahanas* — who had themselves received a secondary education but were concentrated in the school system because all other routes of ecclesiastical advancement were closed to them. For example, between 1833 and 1845, Gabriel *kahana* Patkanian taught modern and classical Armenian, Russian, French, Armenian history, geography, mathematics, and Greek classics at the secondary school in Nakhichevan.²⁹ In this community the repression of secularism had the additional effect of aggravating the competition for educational status between the indigenous *kahanas* and the appointed *vardapets*.³⁰ When Alexander II (1855-1881) relaxed autocratic controls over education and the press early in his reign, these educated *kahanas* and several anti-clerical officials in Nakhichevan attempted guardedly to block the centralizing tendencies of Etchmiadzin, usually in conflict with *vardapets* and higher clergy.³¹

Two other ingredients must be added to the mixture from which non-territorial nationalism developed among the Armenians. First, there is evidence to suggest that Uniate Catholicism, an early force for westernization and enlightenment, spread by the Mekhitarist order among educated Armenians, was losing ground to the Apostolic Church. There were numerous reconversions to the Apostolic faith among Armenian Catholics in the 1840s and 1850s, as the Russian government too grew less tolerant of Catholicism within its borders. Catholicos Nerses' efforts to consolidate clerical control over all aspects of Armenian education was a strong play to cut back Catholic influence — bettering the Jesuits and Mekhitarists at their own game. Because Catholic clerics were markedly better educated than their Apostolic counterparts, advancement came readily to converts to the

²⁹Injikian, *Taregrutiune*, p. 18.

³⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 34-35. Areshian, *Armianskaia pechat'*, pp. 45-46, 48. Cf. Rafayel Patkanian's remarks about the status of Nakhichevan's *kahanas* in 1875; and the biographical sketch of Sargis *episkopos* Jalalian in Mikayel Nalbandian, *Erkeri liakatar zhoghovatsu*, four volumes (Erevan, 1940-1948), II, 456. Etchmiadzin deputed Jalalian to Nakhichevan from 1853 to 1855 as a special plenipotentiary inquisitor (*liazor knich*) for the purpose of examining and censoring the instruction in the local diocesan schools. In 1860-1861, as Primate of Georgia and a member of the Holy Synod, Jalalian was also engaged in examining "freethinking and liberal tendencies" among the *kahanas* and students at the Nersesian Jemaran in Tiflis.

³¹Consistently between 1840 and 1870 the conflict between pro-clerical and pro-secular popular factions in Nakhichevan was a major issue in the regular electoral campaign for the post of town magistrate. Harutium Khalibov, a supporter of Nerses Ashtaraketsi, served two terms as magistrate from 1843 to 1848; and Karapet Hairapetov, Nerses' antagonist, held the office from 1860 to 1862 and again from 1865 to 1867. In 1865 the magistracy took over the important power of issuing internal passports from the local clerical government, which had hitherto exercised this function *de facto* and without explicit sanction under Russian law. [V.B. Barkhudarian, "Nor-Nakhijevani inknarutiune," *Patma-banasirakan handes*, 2(1965):185.]

Church of Etchmiadzin.³² It was this influx of Catholic clerics which prompted Mikayel Nalbandian's accusations of "Jesuitism" in the Armenian Church in the 1850s-1860s. His sensitivity to Catholic influence in the Apostolic administration may be traced back to the old Catholic-Apostolic conflicts in the Black Sea region as much as to his later encounters in Moscow with the sophisticated opposition these new clerical cadres offered to independent secular education and journalism.

Second, the use of the vernacular in modern Armenian literature became both a political and cultural issue in mid-century. Historical and ethnographic novels, poetry, and literary criticism served as didactic vehicles for a great deal of the ideological content of secular nationalism after 1855, and the choice for *ashkharhabar* over the Church's *grabar* was also a choice for reform. The life of Khachatur Abovian (1805-1848) is particularly instructive in this respect. After completing his clerical education at the Nersesian Jemaran in Tiflis and serving as a deacon at Etchmiadzin, Abovian received a scholarship to the University of Dorpat. He graduated in 1836 in philosophy and history and returned to Tiflis where he received permission to establish a special *pansion* with instruction in Armenian and Georgian.³³ In 1839 that school was closed by the government, which noted that the texts had been composed in the most unacceptable and colloquial variant of the Armenian language and that several selections of reading material contained anti-clerical references. Abovian was remanded to Erevan by order of the Third Department (the tsarist police) and forbidden to travel outside the district.³⁴ In the winter of 1840-1841 Abovian composed the first "nationalist" novel in Armenian, *Verk Hayastani* ("Wounds of Armenia"), a work which inaugurated a long series in this genre during the nineteenth century. Abovian's work compared the fate of the *Armianskaia oblast'*, dismembered just the year before, to his personal misfortune at the hands of the Russian government.³⁵ Although the novel begins with an

³²There are only a few published records on the Armenian Catholic communities in Russia for this period. The most detailed contemporary account of the isolation and oppression of Armenian Catholics in Tiflis, Gori, and Akhaltsikh appears in a letter from an apostolic prefect of Georgia, J. Damien, "Missions de la Géorgie," in *Annales de la propagation de la foi*, XVII(1845):316-317, 320-322, 328, 332-333. See also, Bedros Froundjian, *Entstehung und Entwicklung der armenischen Presse und ihr Einfluss auf die neuarmenische Schriftsprache und die politische Meinungsbildung* (Ph.D. dissertation: Free University of Berlin, 1961).

³³V.J. Ghazarian, "Kh. Aboviane ev tsarakan grakanutiune," *Haykakan SSR Gitutiu-neri Akademaiyi Teghekagir*, 9(1965):52; cf. *PSZ*, 2nd ser., IV, no. 3060, August 2, 1829 [*Polozhenie o Zakavkazskikh uchilishchakh*], secs. 10 and 18, which stipulate Russian as the language of instruction at the level of the *gimnaziia* and *pansion*.

³⁴Ghazarian, "Kh. Aboviane," pp. 56, 58, 61.

³⁵Khachatur Abovian, *Verk Hayastani* (Tiflis, 1858). The work could not be published at all during the reign of Nicholas I (1825-1855). In any event significant portions of the

account of Persian and Turkish atrocities against the local Armenian population in the wars of 1828-1829, the focus of attention soon passes to conditions in the region after the supposed Russian "liberation." Abovian believed that russification was being executed so rapidly that in the near future the Armenian language would disappear from its homeland.³⁶ Accordingly, he composed *Verk Hayastani* entirely in the local, unrefined Erevan dialect of Eastern Armenian, "as though an Armenian peasant were relating the story to his neighbor."³⁷ In one especially hyperbolic passage Abovian even has the Russians threatening the Armenian people with exile for speaking their native language.³⁸ For Abovian, the survival of the Armenian language had become part of a desperate political crisis surrounding the suppression of the *oblast'*. Although the romanticized depiction of Russian tyranny bore only an exaggerated resemblance to actual conditions in the *uezdy* of Erevan and Nakhichevan after 1840, the novel is significant as initiator of a modern secular Armenian literature in the vernacular. After the suppression of an active territorial-political life for Russian Armenians, literature, along with the Church and Church politics, became a vital substitute for it in Armenian communities. A secular, non-territorial nationalism grew out of the cultural and political disputes within the Church and the emerging intelligentsia. Its articulation was further refined and expanded by bold young reformers, including Stepanos Nazariants, Rafayel Patkanian, and Mikayel Nalbandian.

II.

MIKAYEL NALBANDIAN (Mikhael Ghazarian Nalbandians) was born in Nakhichevan on November 2, 1829. Almost nothing is known of his family origins or early childhood. His father, Ghazar Nalbandian, a blacksmith, had assumed the inherited family trade; he also engaged in a tar and pitch business in later life to support his large household of thirteen children.³⁹ In 1836

third chapter, which contained anti-Russian passages and references to the backwardness of the Armenian clergy, were censored, and these cuts were not restored until the second edition (1897). Even so, the influence of the novel as a work of nationalist literature was unimpaired. Major contemporary writers who amplified the political and *völkisch* themes in *Verk Hayestani* included the novelists Perch Proshian [Hovhannes Ter-Arakelian] (1837-1907) and Raffi [Hakob Melik-Hakobian] (1835-1888); and the poets Gamar Katipa [Rafayel Patkanian] (1830-1892) and Mikayel Nalbandian (1829-1866). See G.Kh. Stepanian, *et al.*, *Hay nor grakanutian patmutiun* (Erevan, 1962), II, pp. 11, 32, 38, 221, 225, 240, 253, 263.

³⁶Ghazarian, "Kh. Aboviane," p. 147.

³⁷Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 148.

³⁸*Ibid.*, p. 147. The following passage is typical of the sort excised from the 1858 edition: If you're Russian, speak Russian; if you're Turkish, speak Turkish, . . . And if you know your language [that is, Armenian], if you [dare to] speak your language, the Russians will snatch the very bread from your hands. They will send you to Siberia.

³⁹Injikian, *Taregrutiune*, p. 17. Dates for Russia are given in the old style, which was twelve days behind the Western calendar in the nineteenth century.

young Mikayel was sent to a local tutor to learn essentials of reading and writing, and in 1837 he entered the special diocesan school of *kahana* Gabriel Patkanian in the Holy Illuminator (*Surb Lusavorich*) church which he attended the next eight years.⁴⁰ During a visit to Nakhichevan in 1845 Catholicos Nerses ordered Patkanian's school closed and exiled the *kahana* to Norashen monastery in Georgia as an "agitator" and "troublemaker."⁴¹ Nerses and Harutiun Khalibov, the proclerical town magistrate, had determined that Patkanian had exceeded his mandate by promoting secular subjects in the school on his own authority. But the closing only reinforced the belief of some young Armenians, including Nalbandian, that such Western learning had a political dimension that lay outside Church direction. Armenian translations of classical and modern European literature had left a mark on the students as weapons to rid Armenian education of clerical political control.

Patkanian's successor was a much more limited pedagogue. Nalbandian stopped attending class and soon was writing anonymous letters to the authorities complaining about the new teacher. Sometime in 1846-1847 Nalbandian demanded that the Nakhichevan clerical government remove the teacher from his post, but nothing came of his effort.⁴² Despite his differences with the church authorities over the running of the school, Nalbandian found favor with the new primate of Nakhichevan-Bessarabia, Archbishop Matteos Vehapetian, who in 1848 recommended him for the post of diocesan secretary in Kishinev. Nalbandian petitioned the Nakhichevan town council for formal release from his *meshchanin* (townsman) rank so that he could enter clerical service as a deacon.⁴³ For the next five years he worked in Kishinev, but old enemies in Nakhichevan, particularly the magistrate Khalibov, were proceeding to have Nalbandian punished for his anonymous letters. In September 1849 Khalibov sent the offensive letters to Etchmiadzin; and Catholicos Nerses ordered an interrogation of their author, deploring "such impudent writings about favored personages in our society."⁴⁴ By traveling frequently and keeping his whereabouts secret, Nalbandian managed to avoid the interrogation until March 1850, when he appeared in Nakhichevan and presented his defense. He argued that he was innocent, even though in fact he had written the letters. The issues were cloudy and proof difficult to obtain, so that for several years the Church did not force the issue.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, p. 19. For a condensed, but illuminating account of the effect of the changing course of clerical education on Gabriel Patkanian's career as a teacher, see Kerovbe Chrakian, *Hay matenagirner ZhT daru* (Venice, 1904), pp. 143-153.

⁴²Injikian, *Taregrutiune*, pp. 20-21.

⁴³*Ibid.*, pp. 22-23.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, p. 26.

In the meantime, Nalbandian made his literary debut in the Armenian vernacular newspaper, *Ararat* (1850-1851), published by Patkanian in Tiflis. Four poems appeared. One evoked episodes from medieval Armenian history as a device to illustrate the decline of national culture; the other three were directed against clerical education. "An Opinion Regarding Stultifying Education" opens with an ironic monologue in an obsolete Persian style:

Why do you torment yourself, dear child,
to work beyond what is required?
Sacrificing your entire life in study
which is itself a worthless trifle.
Do you wish to be a *vardapet*, a celestial philosopher,
So that the world will admire your garnered wisdom?⁴⁵

This poem was written in Nalbandian's Nakhichevan dialect, the others in classical Armenian. Still experimenting with different styles and literary conventions, Nalbandian was apparently not yet certain of his command of a standard form of the spoken language.

In May 1851 the government suddenly suppressed *Ararat* for a breach of censorship regulations.⁴⁶ The shock to Patkanian was enormous. He soon left Tiflis and returned to Nakhichevan in a futile attempt to re-establish his press. With his mentor back in Nakhichevan, Nalbandian made a second, and equally artless, attempt to dislodge his replacement from the school at Surb Lusavorich. In December 1852 Nalbandian dispatched a "letter of declaration" to Etchmiadzin entitled "The Adherence of the Teacher in the Town of Nakhichevan, Mkrtich Simeonian [Ekenian] to the Roman Confession, and Showing Him to be an Imposturous Armenian Apostolic."⁴⁷ Whatever Nalbandian's motives, the perpetration of such a fantastic slander provoked the Catholicos and the Holy Synod beyond all limits of toleration. Nerses resolved to have Nalbandian arrested immediately and transported to Etchmiadzin for trial. By the end of May 1853 Khalibov had made arrangements with the police in both Taganrog and Kishinev for Nalbandian's arrest. On June 5, Nalbandian evaded a police escort which had

⁴⁵Nalbandian, *Erkeri*, I, 18, 11. 1-4.

⁴⁶Chrakian, *Hay matenagirner*, p. 147; Hovhannes Petrosian, *Hay parberakan mamuli bibliografia (1794-1900)* (Erevan, 1956), I, p. 138. The Viceroy of the Caucasus, in the course of censoring a verse-eulogy to commemorate the death of the only male heir of the Lazarev family, had expressly forbidden the printing of a black border around the poem as an inordinate display of nationalist sentiment. Patkanian disobeyed the directive with the result that the newspaper was summarily closed down. Patkanian also lost his position at the Nersesian Jemaran for this apparently trivial act of defiance. The suppression bears evidence of the increasing crackdown of the Russian authorities on nationalism in the press.

⁴⁷Injikian, *Taregrutiune*, p. 37. The Armenian text reads: "Vasn patkanelutian usutschin Nakhichevan kaghaki Mkrtchi Simeonian Hrovmeakan davanutian ev tsutsaneloi zinkn i verin eres keghtsupatir eghanakav lusavorchakron hay."

surprised him while he was visiting Patkanian in Nakhichevan. He was discharged from clerical service on July 6 and two days later departed secretly for Moscow. In this way Nalbandian's residence in the Armenian society he had known as well as his career in the Apostolic Church, the only institution he had been trained to serve, came to an abrupt and unpromising end.

In Moscow, Nalbandian secured a position as teacher of Armenian at the Lazarev Institute, thanks to the help of his old patron, Primate Vehapetian. But shortly after he began teaching he was arrested (January 23, 1854). Though he was soon released — since he had left clerical service he was no longer under the Church's jurisdiction — he lost his post at the Institute. That fall he entered the medical faculty of Moscow University as an auditor.

While in Moscow, Nalbandian also met Stepanos Nazariants, a professor at the Lazarev Institute and a former colleague of Abovian at Dorpat.⁴⁸ Nazariants was a firm and articulate proponent of secularism in Armenian literature and encouraged Nalbandian's interest in modern Armenian. The gradual change in Nalbandian's medium of composition at this time, from poetry to prose, may be credited to Nazariants' influence. After failing to secure the sponsorship of the Lazarev Institute for an Armenian journal in *ashkharhabar*, Nazariants took advantage of the relaxed Russian censorship in 1856 to approach the Ministry of Public Enlightenment with plans for a new journal, *Hiusisapayl* (Northern Light). Nazariants' independence of action secured the exemption he desired from the inhibitions of clerical and institutional censorship. *Hiusisapayl* became the first Armenian periodical in Russia subject only to the usual restrictions of state censorship. Furthermore, Nazariants circumvented financial dependence on the Lazarevs by funding the journal through sale of advance subscriptions. He calculated that 500 paid subscriptions were needed to assure the financial security of the venture.⁴⁹

In a letter of March 21, 1856, Nalbandian wrote of his association with Nazariants' journal:

We hope to offer the people some modest degree of learning in order to introduce substance and vitality into our otherwise barren literature. Moreover, as this purpose will be accomplished on one hand by our choice of language [*ashkharhabar*], on the other we shall try to make the spirit and direction of our literature as popular as possible. We shall free learning from all clericalism, under which it has lain abandoned and forlorn up to now.⁵⁰

The following year he began work on a prospectus for the journal,

⁴⁸Chrakian, *Hay matenagirner*, pp. 55-67; Stepannos Nazarian, *Stepannos Nazariani erkere* (Tiflis, 1913), I, Zha-TsA [xi-li], introduction by N. Aghbalian.

⁴⁹Injikian, *Taregrutiune*, p. 73; Nazarian, *Stepannos Nazariani erkere*, p. KhB [xlii].

⁵⁰Injikian, *Taregrutiune*, p. 73. Letter to S.G. Sultanshah.

outlining an ambitious series of contents glossed with Russophile sentiments which neither he nor Nazariants genuinely shared. Nazariants in particular felt the Russians to be culturally inferior to Armenians, and the nearly total omission of attention to Russia in the pages of *Hiusisapayl* testifies to his low estimation.⁵¹ On the other hand, Soviet scholars regularly cite the prospectus as proof of the **high** intellectual regard for Russia on the part of progressive Armenians in the 1850s, as though Nalbandian's program necessarily implied the subsequent contents of the journal itself.⁵² In the prospectus Nalbandian identified four areas of popular interest to be covered in the journal: general geography, universal history (including the history of the Russian state), natural history, and moral-aesthetic issues and fiction. "Critical analyses of new books published in both classical and modern Armenian" were to be included "with care taken to avoid all polemical tone and to appraise each work honestly in its proper intellectual sphere."⁵³ These remarks satisfied the Russian censors.

Compared to its predecessors, *Kovkas* and *Ararat*, *Hiusisapayl* stands as a landmark in the modernization and secularization of Armenian intellectual life. Though it rose only to the bare average of contemporary journalism in France, the true model Nazariants sought to emulate, it nevertheless found a ready if modest public. *Hiusisapayl* began publication on January 1, 1858, with an advance subscription of 200. The printing press was set up with a donation of 1,000 rubles from Karapet Hairapetov, leader of the anti-Khalibov party in Nakhichevan, and the journal's aim at combatting Apostolic political influence and Mekhitarist cultural influence in the Armenian communities soon became apparent to its readers. The small number of subscribers testifies to the yet undeveloped Armenian reading public, but Nazariants hoped that the figure would rise as the journal became better known. Its debut coincided with a significant increase in modern Armenian letters in Russia. Besides a host of minor productions, 1858 was the year of publication of Abovian's masterpiece, *Verk Hayastani*; the year before, Nalbandian's translation of the first part of Eugene Sue's *The Wandering Jew* and Rafayel Patkanian's translation of *Robinson Crusoe* had appeared. As formal writing in modern Armenian

⁵¹Nazarian, *Stepannos Nazariani erkere*, p. KhG [xliiii]. The editor of this pre-Soviet collection, N. Aghbalian, puts the case succinctly:

In Russia *Hiusisapayl* was the first Armenian journal in the European sense of the word and with a European outlook. Nazarian had no high opinion of Russian literature and Russian society. His view was directed toward Western Europe, toward the original source of enlightenment. We may explain thereby the circumstance that Russian life and literature have practically no place in *Hiusisapayl*.

⁵²See K.N. Grigorian, "Neizvestnaia stat'ia Mikaela Nalbandiana, napechatannaia v gazete 'mol've', HSSR GAT, 5(1954):1k82-83. The prospectus is reprinted with additional comments in A.M. Injikian and Gr. Harutiunian, *Mikayel Nalbandian: Vaveragreri zhoghovatsu* (Erevan, 1956), pp. 67-69.

⁵³*Ibid.*

steadily gained readership between 1857 and 1861, the Church was concomitantly relaxing its vigilance over the vernacular press. Together with the cooling of government support for the Apostolic hierarchy, the death of Catholicos Nerses in 1857 diminished the likelihood of a forceful response from Etchmiadzin. Central clerical discipline deteriorated further under Nerses' less able successor Matteos I (1858-1865), with the result that by 1860 about a dozen local Armenian presses, unsupervised and unlicensed by Etchmiadzin, had been established in Tiflis.⁵⁴

Some of the new journalistic enterprises indicated a pro-clerical resurgence led by clerics who were determined to stem the secular tide. Stepanos Mandinian's *Meghu Hayastani* (Bee of Armenia) began publication in Tiflis on the same day that *Hiusisapayl* appeared in Moscow. Gabriel Ayvazovskii, a convert from Catholicism, moved *Masiats aghavni* (Dove of Ararat) from Paris to Theodosia in 1859, after his appointment as Primate of Nakhichevan-Bessarabia. To reach a broader audience, both of these journals published many articles in *ashkharhabar*. Indeed, only *Irakagh*, the monthly of the Moscow clerical government, sought to conserve classical Armenian entirely.

For Nalbandian the bid for a popular voice by Apostolic editors called for a recasting of his attacks on clericalism. Hitherto, he had regarded the scholarship and literature of the Mekhitarists as the main impediment to secular enlightenment, and the Apostolics merely their imitators and epigones. He linked the Mekhitarists with the Jesuits, an argument which seemed extreme by the ideological standards of secular nationalists of the day. Catholics were removed from the center of Armenian affairs. Nalbandian's chief effort to date, *The Wandering Jew*, had failed to excite much anti-Catholic sentiment; it never sold well and the remainder lot of 326 copies was sent to his friend Vehapetian in Astrakhan.⁵⁵ By April 1858 Nalbandian began attacking the Apostolic editor Mandinian and *Meghu Hayastani* in a regular column, "Memoirs from the Pages of Count Emmanuel's Diary."⁵⁶ The fictitious Count Emmanuel was, of course, Nalbandian himself, as were all the Count's pseudonymous "correspondents"

⁵⁴Nazarian, *Stepannos Nazariani erkere*, p. 76. The practice of one of these presses in Tiflis throws an interesting sidelight on the processes whereby modern Armenian literature acquired a reading public. The firm of Avedik Enfiachian, the largest Armenian booksellers in Tiflis, refused as a rule to stock legitimate titles printed in Russia. Copies of such works sold very poorly, if at all, because customers habitually considered domestic Armenian books inferior to those produced in Western Europe. Thus, to meet the outstanding demand for Armenian books from abroad, Enfiachian simply ran off title pages with spurious West European imprints and inserted them in the new and cheap modern Armenian editions just appearing in Moscow. These he then retailed at vastly inflated prices.

⁵⁵Injikian, *Taregrutiune*, p. 125. Vehapetian had become Primate of Astrakhan in 1858 upon the election of Catholicos Matteos.

⁵⁶Hishatakaran Koms Emmanuelli oragrakan terterits," *Hiusisapayl*, 4(1858):335-343.

who paraded malicious exposés of Apostolic clerics and other prominent Russian Armenians. The column attracted a good deal of sensational attention over the next two years because of its irreverent caricatures of national authorities. It also helped to boost the subscription list and to keep the journal alive. In the very first column Nalbandian's spokesman attacked the late Catholicos Nerses as well as Mandinian and defended himself by claiming: "I'm telling the truth and there's no falseness in my remarks. Who can stand in the way of the truth?" His interlocutor retorted: "The truth, the truth, but you're forgetting that by speaking **that** truth, you're laying bare the defects and disgrace of the nation."⁵⁷

Pressure against *Hiusisapayl* and against Nalbandian's calumnious "Memoirs" had already begun to mount in June 1858, when Primate Ayvazovskii wrote Nazariants personally to caution him about what he printed.⁵⁸ At the end of August *Meghu Hayastani* published a major editorial protest against Nalbandian's offensive writings.⁵⁹ In September Catholicos Matteos received a weighty protest against the "Memoirs" from an influential professor at the Lazarev Institute.⁶⁰ And, most ominously, in early December Ayvazovskii wrote on his own initiative to the Minister of the Interior, S.S. Lanskoi, denouncing the "Memoirs" and "Nalbandian's defamatory attacks on the late Catholicos Nerses; on Jalalian, the Primate of Georgia; on myself; on several professors at the Lazarev Institute; on the titled councillor Khalibov; and on many others in the most irresponsible fashion."⁶¹ That same month Ayvazovskii prohibited the *kahanas* within his jurisdiction from reading *Hiusisapayl*, after he had discovered that a number of them in Nakhichevan and Moscow had been subscribing to the journal and distributing copies.⁶² Early in 1859 the Primate presented a formal complaint against *Hiusisapayl* to the Minister of Interior and demanded its suppression.⁶³ Nalbandian was ordered to submit Russian translations of his "Memoirs," with attached explanations, for examination by the St. Petersburg Censorship Committee.⁶⁴

Seriously ill with tuberculosis and anxious about his declining health, Nalbandian drew near nervous collapse under this added

⁵⁷*Ibid.*; Nalbandian, *Erkeri*, I, p. 306.

⁵⁸Injikian, *Taregrutiune*, p. 88. Letter of June 20, 1858.

⁵⁹*Meghu Hayastani*, 5(August 30, 1858):278.

⁶⁰Injikian, *Taregrutiune*, pp. 92-93. Letter of M. Mserian.

⁶¹Nalbandian, *Erkeri*, II, pp. 428-429. Letter of December 7, 1858.

⁶²Injikian, *Taregrutiune*, p. 102. In his brief before the diocesan court Ayvazovskii argued that "the publication [of *Hiusisapayl*] is greatly damaging to the orthodox confession of the Armenian Church and to right Christian morals, and it is spreading hatred toward [the late] Catholicos Nerses and the clergy in general."

⁶³*Ibid.*, pp. 108-109.

⁶⁴*Ibid.*, p. 111.

pressure of direct governmental action. Friends quickly raised money to send him to Western Europe in order to remove him from the theater of action and to give him a chance to recover his health. Before departure from Moscow on March 24, the irrepressible polemicist composed a final article supporting the candidacy of the reformer Karapet Hairapetov in the coming elections in Nakhichevan. In this piece Nalbandian argued that the progressive secularization of Western Europe serves as the immediate model at hand for achieving Armenian enlightenment and nationalism, but only if the various Armenian townships themselves elected to modernize their unsatisfactory and antiquated educational systems. "Nakhichevan," he wrote, "like other Armenian towns needs a fundamental national secular school. The immediate caretaker of this school must be the nation itself, without the intervention of clerical functionaries. . . . Such a well-ordered national school would serve, first of all, as a birthplace for the vital enlightenment of our nation."⁶⁵

Nalbandian traveled from Moscow to London, via Warsaw, Berlin, and Paris. He arrived in the British capital on April 24/May 6 and stayed until May 22/June 3, when he departed for Brussels. His circle of intellectual confederates comprised only Armenians. He did not visit the famous Russian exile, Alexander Herzen, then in residence in London. In Paris Nalbandian made a point of calling on Stepan Voskan, the editor of the radical journal *Arevmutk* (Occident). After a final month of travel in Germany he returned to Russia in July. The case against *Hiusisapayl* had resulted in a stern warning to Nazariants against further infractions and in the removal of the sympathetic censor Beroev from his post. The journal's circulation climbed to 350 in August, as the Nakhichevan election drew near and interest in its outcome increased. But by October Nalbandian decided to quit *Hiusisapayl* because of "profound ideological dissension between myself and Nazariants," as he put the matter to a friend.⁶⁶ Nazariants had blamed his associate for bringing on the government's chastisement in the first place, and he feared that Nalbandian would scuttle the journal entirely by repeating his immoderate attacks on the Apostolic clergy. Nalbandian left Moscow for St. Petersburg to continue his medical education.

Nalbandian's sojourn in the West shows in his last significant contribution to *Hiusisapayl*, "A General Discourse Concerning the Nation." This article demonstrates his now-unsettled frame of mind regarding the professed means and ends of secularism. In place of anticlericalism, "A General Discourse" introduces a fundamental social

⁶⁵Nalbandian, *Erkeri*, II, p. 277.

⁶⁶Injikian, *Taregrutiune*, pp. 123-124. Letter to G. Saltikian, October 27, 1859. Nalbandian cites additional reasons for withdrawal, such as the lack of a future with the journal and his worsening financial situation.

distinction as the determinant of secular nationalism. Here Nalbandian contrasted the vital national interest of the common people, "the support and lever of the nation," with the debased interests of the "privileged" class — variously represented as wealth, illegitimate authority, and corrupting foreign influences.⁶⁷ Nalbandian's distinction corresponded closely to Saint-Simon's economic dichotomy between *la classe la plus nombreuse et la plus pauvre* and *les oisifs*, here metamorphosed into a non-economic nationalist formulation. Nalbandian characterized the Armenian people as materially and spiritually impoverished as a result of their lack of national "consciousness" (*gitaktsutian*) and called for a suitable class of *savants* to conduct the coming universal "enlightenment." He proposed the formation of special cadres from a bizarre social amalgam of *kahanas*, schoolteachers, and women. Together they would constitute a makeshift intelligentsia affording a hopeful prognostication for the future of society in much the spirit Saint-Simonian *savants* had published their sermon *prédications* thirty years before.⁶⁸ Significantly, the common feature of these three disparate sectors of Armenian society, besides the fact that in Armenian society one was usually born into them, was that none had yet secured a voice in politics or the press nor was any of them likely to. Whereas the actual Armenian intelligentsia, patterned after the French *gens de lettres*, had already emerged in reaction to the political force of clericalism and was in process of consolidation, it was still undefined as a social group and was unclassifiable in conventional social categories. Nalbandian, for whatever reason, felt compelled to identify the "enlightening" function of this self-defined secular intelligentsia with three groups which had already been socially and sexually defined under traditional patterns.

Using the metaphor of the machine, acquired without doubt in France, Nalbandian came to identify Armenian nationality with the common people:

The support and lever of the nation are the common people. The machine of nationality still turns in the common people no matter how much a nation desires to enrich itself with notable figures. The common people remain the axis, lever and support of the machine.

We always have the common Armenian people in view whenever we speak about the nation; that is, by saying "nation," we do not mean those few people who have risen above the nation's plane on a silver ladder, but rather that poor and pitiable mass of people upon whom the consequences of the nation's misfortune weigh so heavily. What raises in-consolable sadness in my heart is the thought that when the machine of nationality is shattered, the common people of all the nations on earth

⁶⁷"Hasarakabar khosvatsk azgin veraberial," *Hiusisapayl*, 5(1860):378-396.

⁶⁸A highly relevant instance is Abel Transon, *Affranchissement des femmes; prédication du 1er janvier 1832* (Paris, 1832), esp. pp. 1-10.

are subject to heavier deprivations and distress than the privileged — yes, than the wealthy and the traitors. . . .

The machine of our nationality has been shattered. . . . The regeneration of the common people — the machine of nationality — is feasible only by implanting consciousness. And consciousness emerges from enlightenment.⁶⁹

Enlightenment was to come from "genuinely national schools," "schools in which the Armenian language will be heard. . . . We do not recognize as national those schools in which Russian or French is required to be spoken regularly, and Armenian only occasionally."⁷⁰

Nalbandian at this late stage advocated the liberation of the Armenian woman from her traditional roles of social ornament and child-bearer, a description which matched those only of upper-class Armenian women. Indebted to Rousseau's *Emile*, Nalbandian proposed that the Armenian woman exchange her role for a new maternal status cultivating national education:

Armenian women! Today I am addressing you. National regeneration and salvation are only dreams if the domestic life of the nation has withered away.

Mothers are to teach their children the national language. Mothers are to implant the seed of nationality in their young hearts so carefully and intently that neither the freezing storm of the north nor the torrid climate of the south can wither the budding shoots.⁷¹

For Nalbandian the *kahanas*, teachers, and women of Armenian society were the instruments through which nationalistic education could be promoted. These groups were purportedly linked with the intelligentsia proper through their common denominator as literate elites. These elites were responsible for bringing "enlightenment," here understood as popular "consciousness," to the people. Such consciousness was the singular property of the nationalist intelligentsia and had to be turned into a program capable of transmission downward to the masses.

With this extravagant program outlined in his articles, Nalbandian now turned to a practical matter. He was deputed by the town meeting in Nakhichevan to travel to India to secure certain funds which had been donated by wealthy Armenians there for the colony. Before he could leave Russia, however, he had to secure permission from Church authorities in Etchmiadzin and Russian officials in Tiflis. On October 10, 1860, Nalbandian finally stood before the Holy Synod. The members of that august court doubtless wished he had come there much sooner, in that other capacity of the quarrelsome young deacon they might have corrected. He began to speak but was cut short. In silence Catholicos Matteos signed the authorization accrediting

⁶⁹Nalbandian, *Erkeri*, I, pp. 452-455.

⁷⁰*Ibid.*

⁷¹*Ibid.*, I, pp. 456-457.

Nalbandian an Armenian national representative. Three weeks later in Tiflis the Caucasian Viceroy countersigned Nalbandian's papers. That same day, November 1, Nalbandian left Tiflis and boarded the next coastal steamer for Constantinople.⁷² Except for a brief seven weeks following his return in 1862, he would never see Russia as a free man again.

Edited by Ronald Grigor Suny

A POSTSCRIPT: TWELVE YEARS AFTER.

When I wrote this article in 1971 as a seminar paper in Russian history, I had in mind a larger comparison of the intellectual culture of educated Armenians in the Russian Empire with its roots in Western Europe, particularly France. Certainly nothing in this picture of Nalbandian is strange to the world of purported Jesuit "intrigues" uncovered regularly in the French popular press from the 1830s to the 1860s. Nalbandian was in some ways a special instance of this brand of journalism among the Armenians, and perhaps not even the best figure to study. But he was the one most worked upon in this century (thanks largely to efforts of Soviet scholars to make a genuine "revolutionary democrat" of him), and he was not so far outside the mainstream as to be a maverick. He was to me a subject of convenience, used not so much for what he thought himself as for what channels his thought touched. In this way the topic grew, and I soon realized that here (as with most things Armenian) several intellectual currents from abroad fed into the educated Armenian community in Russia without being tagged clearly as foreign in origin.

At the same time Armenian thought is surprisingly **untouched** by intellectual movements in Russia, the more so because from early in the eighteenth century the Russian Church had been little more than another department of state, lacking a Patriarch and governed by a secular minister appointed by the tsar. By contrast, all educated Armenians, whether within or outside the clergy, expended a great deal of political and intellectual effort upon issues touching their Church, since such issues were numerous and various. The Church was everywhere. Thus I had found several themes ripe for exposition, but to do justice to any of them would have taken a dissertation, a task which in the end I decided not to undertake. What this article offers is a descriptive sketch of Armenian cultural nationalism from the 1840s to 1860s. It is probably as fully drawn as any, but it is not particularly well suited as a pattern for what comes after. This article does not point up or tone down matters which may prove to be either major or minor features of Armenian nationalism as it develops later in the century.

⁷²Injikian, *Taregrutiune*, pp. 144-148.

To reiterate, Nalbandian was certainly not a principal actor in efforts to secularize the educational system — as Soviet scholars usually make him out to be. Yet his example does bring out the journalistic side of cultural nationalism rather more sharply than writings of others do. The journalists, who generally were not deep thinkers, tested each other's wits over native matters with means and arguments essentially French in origin and scope. We may better explain Nalbandian's several changes of mind from 1850 to 1860 by citing his widening exposure to French intellectual currents than by searching for some critical evolution within his own thought.

If form and content are set aside as French, what Russian elements, if any, contributed to the makeup of non-territorial Armenian nationalism from the 1840s to the 1860s? Ironically, when the Russian government determined in 1836-1840 to halt Armenian territorial nationalism in the *oblast'*, it completed the background for a rapid spread of the same phenomenon in non-territorial form. By 1840, together with the Ministry of Finance, and in 1842 with the Sixth Section of His Majesty's Own Chancery, the Russian Ministry of the Interior was carrying out policies to absorb the new territories gained along the southern frontier in the previous seventy-five years. These territories stretched from the Ukraine to Transcaucasia and all had Armenians in them. Over that expanse, as each new Armenian community had come into the empire, it was able to negotiate its own particular tax laws and legal and trade charters, to make its "best deal" with the Russians as it were. When ministries of the Russian government resolved in 1836 to clear away this Armenian patchwork, their aim was to bring the several different law codes, tax rates, special trading privileges, and charters under a uniform system which applied to all Armenians wherever they resided in the empire. Now Armenians in one colony or settlement could no longer negotiate tax and trade privileges with their nominal Russian masters that were in turn denied to Armenians of another colony, region, or territory. The inequities in that old system were a chronic source of discord among the various Armenian communities. The Caucasian Armenians, although the most numerous, lay at the bottom of the heap, the Russians having handed out most of the plums before reaching Erevan in 1828.

From 1836 to 1845 these new civil and tax statutes steadily brought all Armenians of the empire under a consistent set of codes. Yet the Russian government, in carrying out such narrow administrative measures to deal with local Armenian nationalism in the *oblast'* and to realize political control over all its Armenian subjects in an efficient way, made by the same strokes a profound breach between Armenian and Russian intellectual concerns. The great enhancement of the Church's political role was the most pronounced of these measures. Armenian non-territorial and especially cultural nationalism thrived

on just this sort of breach at bottom between the educated sectors of Russians and Armenians — knowing at last who **they** are and who **we** are. Thanks to the Russian government, Armenians after 1845 were legally and fiscally part of a single body. Before this, Armenians in Russia did not view themselves as part of a coherent community except as co-religionists. Tied to their localities, they behaved according to whatever peculiarities of status each locality enjoyed in Russian enactments. Henceforth, the broad-brush picture is that wherever they dwelt, Armenians saw the **same** Russians; and the Russian government, wherever it flexed its legal and fiscal muscle, saw the **same** Armenians. Thus the Russian government enacted, without first consulting those affected, the earliest consistent definition of Armenian "nationality" in Russia. Armenian intellectuals quickly worked up forms of nationalism to fit this fairly uniform statutory "unification" imposed suddenly from above. Within a few years those among them who were secularizers, like Nalbandian, began to address cultural questions of who these new Armenians **might become** as a nation, even though the nationalists' particular French borrowings, applied haphazardly to native issues and aspirations, fell rather short of providing satisfactory answers. ■

Cultural and Literary Awakening of Western Armenians, 1789-1915

Vahé Oshagan

THE emergence of Western Armenians from their long dark ages was a painful and slow process, extending over the eighteenth and half of the nineteenth centuries. During the eighteenth century, the Apostolic Church was the dominant institution; almost all the important scholars and teachers (Baghtasar Dpir, Arsen Dpir, Tiratsou Murad, Kharbertsi Ghukas Vardarpet, the Patriarchs Kolot and Nalian, the ill-fated Patriarch Avedik, and so on) came from the Church. The major social tensions of the century — the constant conflict between *amiras* and the Patriarchate that started in 1685 and lasted more than two centuries, the ferocious struggle beginning around 1700 between the Apostolic Church and Catholic missionaries — were church-related. One side-effect of the latter struggle was the founding of the Mekhitarist congregation in 1701 which had far-reaching impact on the course of Armenian letters.

Less significant were the secular forces at work in the Ottoman Empire. It had long been the custom of wealthy and mainly Catholic Armenians (as well as Greeks) to send their sons to Italian universities for higher education. These families were always ready to accept contemporary Western ideas and transmit them to the less educated classes. In general, because of their traditional interest in Western cultures, they often incurred the hostility of the Ottoman government as well as the Apostolic Church which had become "guardian" of national values. The "elites" of Constantinople included the *amiras* — families such as the Tuzians, Palian, Pezjians, and Jezayirlians — who, because of their wealth and the high-finance or administrative positions they held within the Empire, wielded great influence with